



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,952	09/16/2003	Samar Choudhary	RSW920030153US1 (118)	3845

46320 7590 10/09/2007
CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP
STEVEN M. GREENBERG
950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE
SUITE 3020
BOCA RATON, FL 33487

EXAMINER

VERDI, KIMBLEANN C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2194

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/09/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/663,952

Applicant(s)

CHOUDHARY ET AL.

Examiner

KimbleAnn Verdi

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to the Amendment filed on July 2, 2007. Claims 1-18 are pending in the current application. All previously outstanding objections and rejections to the Applicant's disclosure and claims not contained in this Action have been respectfully withdrawn by the Examiner hereto.

Response to Amendment

1. Amendment to the specification and claims overcomes the previous objection to the specification and claims.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3-8, and 10-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0073195 A1 to Hellerstein et al. (hereinafter Hellerstein) in view of United States Patent Application Publication 2002/0169842 A1 to Christensen et al. (hereinafter Christensen).
5. As to claim 1, Hellerstein teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a user centric policy creation and enforcement method comprising the steps of:

establishing correlations between said observed state changes and action invocations (paragraph [0023]);

formulating rules in a policy based upon user selected ones of said established correlations (paragraph [0062]), each of said rules specifying a state change in at least one of said applications (paragraph [0044]), and at least one resulting action invocation in at least one other of said applications (paragraph [0018]); and

applying said policy to automatically respond to each subsequently observed state change with a specified action invocation (paragraph [0049]).

Hellerstein does not explicitly disclose observing state changes and action invocations in disparate applications through visual views of said applications.

However Christensen discloses observing state changes and action invocations in disparate applications through visual views of said applications (paragraphs [0016]-[0025] and [0179]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Event Management System of Hellerstein with the teachings of Integration Framework from Christensen because this feature would have provided a mechanism to enable the exchange of data and/or events between disparate systems and an execution environment for the business logic required to map the data and event models of the disparate systems (paragraphs [0017]-[0018]).

6. As to claim 3, Hellerstein teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said step of establishing comprises the steps of:

noting a time for each of said observed state changes (paragraph [0003]);

Art Unit: 2194

further noting a time for each of said action invocations (paragraph [0049] and [0057]); and,

correlating said observed state changes with said action invocations based upon said noted times (e.g. generating rules from historical event data, paragraph [0049] and [0051]).

7. As to claim 4, this claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 since claim 4 recites the same or equivalent invention, see the rejection to claim 1 above.

8. As to claim 5, Hellerstein as modified teaches the system of claim 4, wherein said user interface views comprise portlet views (paragraph [0179] of Christensen).

9. As to claim 6, Hellerstein as modified the system of claim 4, wherein said policy interface unit is disposed within an integrated solutions console (paragraphs [0183]-[0184] of Christensen).

10. As to claim 7, this claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 since claim 7 recites the same or equivalent invention, see the rejection to claim 1 above.

11. As to claim 8, this claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 since claim 8 recites the same or equivalent invention, see the rejection to claim 1 above.

12. As to claim 10, this claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 3 since claim 10 recites the same or equivalent invention, see the rejection to claim 3 above.

13. As to claim 11, this claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 since claim 11 recites the same or equivalent invention, see the rejection to claim 1 above.

14. As to claim 12, this claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 4 since claim 12 recites the same or equivalent invention, see the rejection to claim 4 above.

Art Unit: 2194

15. As to claim 13, Hellerstein as modified teaches the method of claim 11, further comprising the step of enforcing said policy in said at least one other policy interface unit (paragraph [0091] of Christensen) to automatically respond to each subsequently observed state change with a specified action invocation (paragraph [0049] of Hellerstein).

16. As to claim 14, Hellerstein as modified teaches the method of claim 13, further comprising the step of limiting said enforcing of said policy in said at least one other policy interface unit based upon pre-defined permissions (paragraph [0193] of Christensen).

17. As to claims 15-18, these claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 11-14 respectively, since claims 15-18 recite the same or equivalent invention, see the rejections to claims 11-14 above.

18. Claims 2 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0073195 A1 to Hellerstein et al. (hereinafter Hellerstein) in view of United States Patent Application Publication 2002/0169842 A1 to Christensen et al. (hereinafter Christensen) as applied to claims 1 and 8 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,965,900 B2 to Srinivasa et al. (hereinafter Srinivasa).

19. As to claim 2, Hellerstein as modified by Christensen does not explicitly teach wherein said step of observing comprises the steps of:

page crawling markup defining a visual view of said applications; and,

demarcating segments of said markup as segments which visually indicate state changes in said applications.

However Srinivasa teaches wherein said step of observing comprises the steps of:

page crawling (crawling agents called category agents 120a-120n, 122a-122n, Fig. 3, lines 38-42) markup defining a visual view of said applications (Essential Dimension Markup Language and Event Markup Language, col. 9, lines 35-40); and,

demarcating (e.g. marking) segments of said markup as segments which visually indicate state changes (e.g. event description) in said applications (sequence marked as potential event description, col. 9, lines 42-44).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified the Event Management System of Hellerstein as modified by Christensen with the teachings of page crawling and demarcating (e.g. marking) from Srinivasa because these features would have provided the Web-based Enterprise Management environment of Sanghvi with a special markup language to identify primary components (used to detect events) between the HTML/XML tags of a document (event extraction 90, Fig. 2, col. 9, lines 35-38) and category agents (web crawler) programmed to search for HTML and XML text (col. 10, lines 32-34).

20. As to claim 9, this claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 2 since claim 9 recites the same or equivalent invention, see the rejection to claim 2 above.

Art Unit: 2194

Conclusion

21. The prior art made of record on the accompanying PTO-892 and not relied upon, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KimbleAnn Verdi whose telephone number is (571) 270-1654. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30am-5:00pm EST..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KV
October 1, 2007


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER